

Continuing Education Project

Report to the CA Board of Psychology

April, 2005

**Continuing Education Project
Report to the CA Board of Psychology**

April, 2005

Contents

I. What's Happening Across the Country?	1
II. Toward a Framework for Thinking About Continuing Education Topics	4
III. Ongoing General Concerns	6
Mandates: What Topics?	6
Independent Study: What Proportion of Required Hours?	7
IV. Four Continuing Concerns	15
Law and Ethics Requirement	15
Supervision Course Mandate	19
Enhancing Diversity Competence	20
Convincing the Legislature Not to Mandate CE Courses	20
Appendices	22
A. "Competencies in Professional Psychology" – an article by Nadine Kaslow in the <i>American Psychologist</i> , November, 2004.	
B. Some Research and Related Literature Relevant to Discussion of Delivery Formats	
C. Some Proposals Submitted by Respondents	
Tables	
1. Continuing Education Requirements Across the USA and in Canada	2
2. Outlining a Conceptual Framework to Help Clarify the Curriculum Content and Competencies for Clinical Psychology Practitioners	5
3. About Expanding the Number of Hours Allowed for Independent Study: Comments from Professional Psychologists Around the State	9
4. About Altering the Law and Ethics Regulation: Comments from Professional Psychologists Around the State	16
Exhibit	
<i>Web-Based Instruction: Current State of the Research</i>	8

Continuing Education Project

Report to the CA Board of Psychology

In keeping with the current strategic plan formulated by the California Board of Psychology and as a basis for future discussion and decision making, the Board's Continuing Education committee initiated a project designed to provide a "big picture" overview of education topics relevant to licensing and consumer protection. This report summarizes that effort.

The report also presents findings related to two general concerns related to the 36 hours of continuing education required of psychologists in California every two years. The concerns center around (a) mandated topics and (b) the proportion of required hours that can be met through independent study.

Finally, feedback is summarized from a segment of licensed California psychologists with respect to four ongoing concerns: (a) revision of regulations related to updating licensees on law and ethics, (b) supervision course mandate, (c) enhancing diversity competence, and (d) convincing the legislature not to mandate CE courses.

I. What's Happening Across the Country?

Board staff reviewed and compiled information on continuing education requirements across the U.S.A. and in Canada. Table 1 summarizes information from a total of 62 states, territories, and provinces.

In addition recent work on enhancing competency in professional psychology was reviewed. A helpful contemporary perspective on the movement for competency-based education and credentialing is provided in an article by Nadine Kaslow entitled "Competencies in Professional Psychology" (published in *American Psychologist*, Nov. 2004). The article is included in Appendix A. In that article, Kaslow cautions:

It is difficult to define psychology in a coherent fashion and psychologists have had problems in delineating uniform standards and expectations. It is important that doing so does not lead to a required curriculum that would place unwanted constraints on programs and prohibit the diversity of training approaches needed to keep abreast of changes in psychology and related fields. Psychologists must not define competencies in a manner that reduces the profession to a collection of specific skills that might or might not require educational/experiential training, and as a result, train technicians rather than professionals.

*As was done with the Board's work in developing an outline on "Diversity Competence for Psychological Practitioners," the national Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA volunteered its resources to help facilitate the work and prepare this report.

Table 1
Continuing Education Requirements Across the USA and in Canada

STATE	HOURS REQUIRED	DISTANCE LEARNING ALLOWED?	SPECIFICS
Alabama	20 hrs per year	100%	
Alaska	20 hrs per year	50% (10 hours)	3 hours in professional ethics
Alberta	Not required		
Arizona	60 hrs every two years	100%	4 hours in professional ethics
Arkansas	40 hrs every two years	50% (20 hours)	
British Columbia	35 hrs every year	11 hours of independent study (maximum of 6 hrs online)	5 hours in ethics - Bylaws are available at www.collegeofpsychologists.bc.ca
California	36 every two years	22% (8 hours)	4 hours in laws and ethics
Colorado	Not required		
Connecticut	Not required		
Delaware	40 hrs every two years	100%	
District of Columbia	30 hrs every two years	unable to contact	
Florida	40 hrs every two years	100%	3 hours in laws and ethics, 2 hours in prevention of medical errors, 1 hour in domestic violence or end of life and palliative health care
Georgia	40 hrs every two years	100%	3 hours in ethics, 3 hours in pharmacology - Licensees renewing for the first time need to take a course in cultural diversity if it was not part of their degree program.
Hawaii	Not required		
Idaho	20 hrs per year	6 hours of individual study	
Illinois	Not required		
Indiana	Not required		
Iowa	40 hrs every two years	100%	Maximum of 20 hours granted for scholarly research and preparation
Kansas	100 hrs every two years	100%	3 hours in ethics, 6 hours must be related to diagnosis and treatment
Kentucky	30 hrs every three years	100%	
Louisiana	30 hrs every two years	100%	2 hours in ethics and/or forensics
Maine	40 hrs every two years	Unable to contact.	
Manitoba	Not required		
Maryland	40 hrs every two years	40% (16 hours)	3 hours in ethics
Massachusetts	20 hrs every two years	qualifies, must be APA approved.	Up to 10 hours can be from psychology publication if peer reviewed journal or book
Michigan	Not required		
Minnesota	40 hrs every two years	100%	
Mississippi	20 hrs every two years	100%	2 hours in ethics/ legal issues

Missouri	40 hrs every two years		
Montana	40 hrs every two years	100%	
Nebraska	*24 hrs every two years	100%	
Nevada	30 hrs every two years	50% (15 hours)	6 hours in ethics
New Brunswick	Not required		
New Hampshire	40 hrs every two years	50% (20 hours)	6 hours in ethics
New Jersey	Not required		
New Mexico	60 hrs every three years	67% (40 hours)	6 hours in multi-cultural
New York	Not required		
Newfoundland & Labrador	Not required		
North Carolina	18 hrs every two years	100%	
North Dakota	40 hrs every two years	100%	
Nova Scotia	Not required (to be developed under new legislation)		
Ohio	23 hrs every two years	100%	3 hours in professional conduct and ethics
Oklahoma	20 hrs every two years	100%	3 hours in ethics
Ontario	Not required		
Oregon	50 hrs every two years	100%	4 hours in ethics
Pennsylvania	30 hrs every two years	50% (15 hours)	3 hours in ethics
Prince Edward Island	Not required		
Quebec	Not required		
Rhode Island	40 hrs every two years	50% (20 hours)	
Saskatchewan	Not required		
South Carolina	24 hrs every two years	100%	
South Dakota	Not required		
Tennessee	40 hrs every two years	22 hours	
Texas	12 hrs per year	100%	3 in ethics, the Board's Rules of Conduct, or professional responsibility
Utah	48 hrs every two years		
Vermont	60 hrs every two years	50% (30 hours)	6 hours in ethics
Virginia	14 hours every year	50% (7 hours)	1.5 hours in ethics, standards of practice, or laws governing the practice of psychology in Virginia
Virgin Islands	18 hrs every two years	Unable to contact	
Washington	60 hrs every three years	100%	4 hours in ethics.
West Virginia	20 hrs every two years	Unable to contact	3 hours in ethics.
Wisconsin	40 hrs every two years	100%	6 hours in ethics
Wyoming	30 hrs every two years	33% (10 hours)	

II. Toward a Framework for Thinking About Continuing Education Topics

At the November 2004 Board meeting, it was decided to initiate a process designed to develop a conceptual framework for the content of a curriculum that enhances the practice of clinical psychology in ways that provide appropriate and effective consumer protection. The emphasis is on outlining the knowledge, skills, and attitudes associated with efforts to develop professional competence for effectively and ethically meeting client needs and for playing a role in advancing the field and enhancing equity.

It is clear that continuing education (CE) can be a significant factor in enhancing consumer protection. However, the degree to which it plays a role is dependent on how well the CE is conceived and delivered.

One presumption underlying continuing education is that what is learned pre-licensure and during initial induction into the field provide at least a minimal orientation and level of competency to practice in the MH field. Post licensure the need is to deepen and broaden competence and perspective. Furthermore, consumer protection is seen as requiring professional understanding and commitment to advancing the state of the art and science of professional practice in the MH field.

At the November meeting, it was decided to use a starter outline as a stimulus to elicit input for developing a working framework. The starter outline was developed and circulated widely to directors of graduate programs, providers of CE throughout the state, and others with expertise. Recommendations were requested for improving the outline. The intent was then to revise and recirculate the outline for final input before presenting the reworked outline to the Board as a working guide.

For whatever reasons, no suggestions were received about revising the outline. Rather, respondents used the invitation to advocate for mandating that facet of the outline dealing with diversity or for discussing the pros and cons of mandated CE requirements and of distance learning. These matters are the focus of Parts III and IV of this report.

Because no changes were proposed, the “starter” outline is included here as a tool for the board to use as a frame of reference in discussing the topic of mandated courses (see Table 2). The focus of the outline is on a conceptual framework for the content of a curriculum that enhances the practice of clinical psychology in ways that provide appropriate and effective consumer protection. The emphasis is on the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that lead to and maintain an ever increasing level of professional competence to meet client needs effectively and ethically and to play a role in enhancing knowledge and equity.

Table 2

Outlining a Conceptual Framework to Help Clarify the Curriculum Content and Competencies for Clinical Psychology Practitioners*

I. Arenas of Concern

- A. Areas of Focus
 - 1. Psychopathology and Psychoneurological Problems
 - 2. Psychosocial and Psychoeducational Problems
 - 3. Developmental Problems
 - 4. Promotion of Mental Health
 - 5. Specializations
- B. General Topics
 - 1. Etiology/models of cause/protective buffers
 - 2. Classification/nosology (schemes for differentiation; comorbidity implications)
 - 3. Prevalence and incidence
 - 4. Development/progression/prognosis
 - 5. Evidence of intervention efficacy and effectiveness; use of science-base to guide practice)
 - 6. Assessment/Consultation/Intervention Decision Making and Planning
 - 7. Models of problem correction and prevention; models for MH promotion
 - 8. Quality control and accountability
- C. Ethical/Legal Matters
 - 1. Social philosophical bases of ethics and law
 - 2. Maximizing benefits to individuals, groups, society
 - 3. Minimizing costs, including iatrogenic effects to individual, groups, culture
 - 4. Client rights
 - 5. Practitioner responsibilities
 - 6. Malpractice concerns
- D. Diversity – see outline on board website --
http://www.psychboard.ca.gov/contin_edu/diversity_report.pdf
- E. Public Policy and Field Perspective
 - 1. Perspective – looking back (history) and looking forward (where are we going/where should we be going)
 - 2. Advancing the subdiscipline of clinical psychology
 - 3. Advancing the MH field
- F. Research and Theory
 - 1. Understanding correlational vs. transforming research; quantitative and qualitative approaches
 - 2. Accessing and evaluating relevant resources
 - 3. Contributing to the literature

II. Specific Practices

- A. Assessment Procedures for
 - 1. Classification
 - 2. Triage/referral/selection/placement
 - 3. Specific intervention planning
 - 4. Evaluation/case monitoring/progress and cost-benefit reviews
- B. Interventions (person-oriented, environment-oriented, system-oriented, multifaceted) for
 - 1. Promotion and prevention
 - 2. Early after problem onset
 - 3. Treatment for chronic/severe/pervasive problems
 - 4. Areas of specialization
- C. Relationships and Alliances
 - 1. Interpersonal functioning
 - 2. Therapeutic alliances
 - 3. Interprofessional collaboration
- D. Practice settings (e.g., agencies, private offices, schools, hospitals, courtrooms)
- E. Case management
 - 1. Intervention coordination/integration
 - 2. Record keeping
 - 3. Billing
- F. Professional Consultation, Education, and Supervision
 - 1. Technical Competence and Tools
 - 2. Personal and Interpersonal Factors
 - 3. Feedback and Evaluation

*Obviously, the above doesn't cover everything and the outline only goes to the third level. It is meant only as a stimulus for discussion, analyses, and making recommendations.

III Ongoing General Concerns

Two general concerns related to the 36 hours of continuing education required of psychologists in California involve

X mandated topics

X proportion of required hours that can be met through independent study

Mandates: What topics? In deciding to mandate a topic, the question is not: *What should practitioners know?* The question is: *What must the Board mandate to ensure consumers are appropriately protected?* From this perspective, several considerations arise.

(1) What *topics require mandated* continuing education to ensure development of an appropriate level of practitioner competence? (Use the information in Table 1 and the outline in Table 2 as frames of reference.)

(2) What *criteria* should be used in making the decision to mandate a given topic?

Criteria for arguing for a mandate should reflect

X evolving standards of practice, the growing knowledge base, and changes in laws and regulations and include evidence that the mandate is *essential for enhancing the protection of the majority of consumers served*

X concerns about sequencing mandates – Given that the needs of new licensees differ from intermediate and advanced level practitioners, criteria must clarify when the mandate becomes essential (What should be required of new licensees? What should be required subsequently?)

X evidence to support how often updates are needed when periodic updating is called for (e.g., with respect to maintaining appropriate consumer protection: How much change occurs over a given period of time? What level of competence needs to be maintained? Is updating needed at *every* license renewal, every 4 years, or ?)

X concerns about what proportion of the 36 hours are appropriately devoted to mandated topics

(3) What criteria should be used to determine whether a CE mandate has been met appropriately?

General Comment from a Respondent

“I appreciate the challenges inherent in designing meaningful CE standards for the state of California. The continuing education needs of a therapist in a rural northern county of our state are different from the CE needs of a psychologist in an urban HIV clinic. Some private practitioners have a narrow scope of practice (e.g., working with couples with fertility issues); other therapists accept clients with diverse therapy issues. Some psychologists conduct multilingual therapy and primarily see clients of particular ethnicities matched to those languages; other therapists see English speaking clients only, of either few or many different ethnicities.”

Independent study: What proportion of required hours? The following may help provide some perspective on the matter of independent study vs. face-to-face classes and workshops:

- X There are a range of ways continuing education is delivered, such as lectures, presentations, workshops, reading, formal on-the-job inservice training, and computer and web-based instruction. Some of these involve group learning formats with “live” input and sometimes discussion, and some are formatted as independent study. Distance learning may involve both formats.
- X The research comparing delivery formats has focused mainly on computer-based independent study vs. classroom/workshop teaching. Distance learning studies have focused mainly on those using strategies that use web-based instruction and minimize interaction. Exhibit 1 provides a brief excerpt from a recent article highlighting the research, and Appendix B provides a smattering of recent references. In general, the reviews indicate “no significant differences” between face-to-face classes and web-based offerings in terms of learning and satisfaction.

Current regulations *allow* for 18 hours to be met through independent study. No one is required to choose this option. A proposal before the Board calls for allowing all 36 hours to be met through independent study. Reactions to this proposal were solicited through a request in the California Psychological Association newsletter. A total of 60 responses were received by the Board via email. Of these 39 favored the proposal and 21 did not. The responses were disaggregated to determine the views of (a) those who were Consumers of CE who were not also providers (18 voted for and 5 against), (b) those who were CE Providers (8 voted for and 5 against) and (c) those who did not indicate whether they were also CE providers (13 voted for and 11 against). A sampling of comments specific to independent study is provided in Table 3.

#####

A Couple of General Comments about CE from Psychologists Around the State

“The goal of protecting the public can be met by (1) ensuring the level of competence represented by the doctoral degree and other licensure requirements as they are, and by (2) ensuring integrity in practitioners. Reasonable CE plus existing requirements for licensure serve the first point adequately; there may be no way of achieving the second; certainly not by requiring course work of increasingly refined and/or expanded content. Experience plus integrity increases our competence and our responsibility, unless the practitioner is indifferent, and there’s no cure for that!”

“In my opinion, the ONLY thing that can truly be accomplished with continuing education is increased knowledge and thought about that knowledge. What CE cannot do is create genuine competence. For areas of practice in which a psychologist is already well trained and experienced, CE can help sustain/increase that competence. For areas of practice in which a psychologist has little or no training or experience, CE courses can initiate thought and new learning, but they CANNOT confer competence. You cannot ‘create’ an ethical psychologist with a mandatory ethics course for licensure renewal, but you can certainly remind everyone of the critical importance of ethical practice. You cannot ‘create’ competence in diversity with a mandatory CE course, but you can certainly remind everyone of this critical (and often neglected) implication for practice. In either case, reinforcing prior competence or generating new learning, the learning which occurs and the ongoing thinking that results from CE is quite frankly dependent on the quality of material and quality of the instructor.”

Exhibit 1

Web-Based Instruction: Current State of the Research

Excerpted from: Instructional immediacy and the seven principles: Strategies for facilitating online courses. By H. Hutchins (2003). *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, VI., Distance Education Center, State University of West Georgia. www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall63/hutchins63.html

“Much has been made of assessing web-based classes over the past 20 years. In many research circles, the overwhelming concern has been whether traditional (face-face) classes and those taught via the web fare the same in terms of student achievement and satisfaction. Others have focused on which technology is best for web-based classes, while still others are concerned with instructional design issues and determining which design features are essential for web-based courses in terms of clarity, consistency, and in ease of use. While important areas of inquiry and subsequent development, concern with instructional effectiveness, or how an instructor can best direct, facilitate, and support ... academic ends ... has received considerably less attention.”

...
“Countless studies have found student achievement in web-based classes is comparable or better than that found in face-face instructional settings. Still others, when looking at both achievement and student satisfaction ... found similar results. ... As researchers are less concerned with the comparative value of offering a web-based class, their concern with specific learner characteristics, learning models, and curriculum restructuring indicate a shift in the research paradigm. ... The IHEP [Institute for Higher Education] (2000) report, a sequel to the widely cited 1999 report that identified ‘gaps in the literature,’ ... cited 24 benchmarks considered essential for ensuring quality and excellence....”

References cited for the above: (More references in Appendix B)

Arbaugh, J. B. (2000). Virtual classroom versus physical classroom: An exploratory study of class discussion patterns and student learning in an asynchronous Internet-based MBA course. *Journal of Management Education*, 24, 213-223.

Arbaugh, J. B. (2000b). Virtual classroom characteristics and student satisfaction with Internet-based MBA classes. *Journal of Management Education*, 24, 32-54.

Carrell, L. J., & Menzel, K. E. (2001). Variations in learning, motivation, and perceived immediacy between live and distance education classrooms. *Communication Education*, 50, 230-240.

Clark, R. A., & Jones, A. (2001). A comparison of traditional and online formats in a public speaking course. *Communication Education*, 50, 109-124.

Comeaux, P. (1995). The impact of an interactive distance learning network on classroom communication. *Communication Education*, 44, 353-361.

Dobrin, J. (1999, June). Who's teaching online. *ITPE News*, 6-7.

Institute for Higher Education Policy (1999). *What's the difference: A review of contemporary research on the effectiveness of distance learning in higher education*. Retrieved online January 2000, from <http://www.ihep.com/PUB.html>

Institute for Higher Education Policy (2000). *Quality on the line: Benchmarks for success in internet-based distance education*. Retrieved online March 22, 2002, from <http://www.ihep.com/PUB.html>

Keogh, G. & Smeaton, A. (1999). An analysis of the use of virtual delivery of undergraduate lectures. *Computers and Education*, 83-94.

Swan, K. (2001). Virtual interaction: Design factors affecting student satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online courses. *Distance Education*, 22, 306-331.

Table 3

**About Expanding the Number of Hours Allowed for Independent Study:
Comments from Professional Psychologists Around the State**

Many respondents mainly indicated their “vote.” The following examples are from those who also offered commentary. (In selecting comments, some effort was made to avoid redundancy.)

I. Comments *supporting* a full 36 hours of Independent Study

A. *Consumers of CE who are not also providers*

#1. Allowing all 36 CEs doesn't bar someone from attending live seminars or conferences. Currently, when reimbursement fees are declining and we have to spend so much money on CEs (the seminars are expensive), we should be able to have at least one allowance, the flexibility of our time and location of obtaining CE credit.

#2. I practice in a remote, rural area. For me to attend in person means considerable travel time, usually a hotel stay. . . . With home study, I can keep my caseload happy and see them, and do the CEUs in my spare time. For in-person training, I usually have to take days off work. I also find it much more comfortable and better learning to be able to sit in my favorite easy chair at home to learn at my own pace, where I can take breaks when I want and go over and over certain parts, as opposed to conforming to someone else's schedule and pace. Psychologists in private practice these days do not make that much as it is, especially in comparison to the 10 years of higher education needed to get the license. Why add unnecessary travel costs, unpaid time and other discomforts post-license? Finally, and most important, the reason given for not allowing us to get all our CEUs at home, should we so choose, is, as I understand it, that "the Board feels it is better for psychologists to come out and meet each other". This strikes me as highly paternalistic, irritating, and condescending. I am an adult. Can't I decide what is good for me? I can still choose to get any part of it in person. But if I decide it is better for me to do it through home-study, does the board really know better than I do what works best for me?

#3. In medicine, I usually obtain all of my CEUs by remote learning, and have for many years. This permits me to do it at my own speed, when it fits into my busy schedule, to spend more time in certain areas than I otherwise might be able to, and to pick and choose among a larger number of offerings. I do not feel it is any less valuable than live courses, and often experts in a particular field have written the remote trainings. Usually extensive references and further readings are provided with the material and I find that I often research them. Finally, it seems to me that the remote courses are far less expensive but no less valuable.

#4. I have taken self-study/distance learning courses, and I found them quite sufficient for CE purposes. The Board of Behavioral Sciences allows all 36 hours of CE each licensing cycle to be taken via self-study/distance learning, and I recommend the Board of Psychology adopt the same policy. The only ones who truly benefit from required on-site CE are the providers of such services, who gain financially.

#5. I am a licensed Psychologist in CA and WA. I am currently doing work in both states and attempting to keep up with CEU requirements in order to keep my licenses active. In WA, I can acquire all of my CEUs by self-study or distance learning. That's great because I live about 2 hours from the nearest city and the majority of workshops/seminars. Living in a more rural area makes it really difficult and expensive (i.e. travel, hotel, seminar, meals, parking) to acquire CEUs with the on-site requirement. I currently am temporarily in PA (in a rural area) taking care

of family health issues. Now, it's even more difficult. I, again, am in a rural area and would have to travel a great distance to acquire CEUs to keep up my license requirements. That's next to impossible given the crisis situation that I am currently managing. Being able to do more home study would solve the problem. Being able to acquire all of my CEUs by self-study/long distance gives me more flexibility to acquire the courses that I really want and need to increase my skills, instead of taking just the ones that are offered in cities "nearby". It would certainly also assist me by decreasing my expenses incurred in traveling to and staying in cities where I need to attend seminars. I would probably still attend some on-site seminars when possible because I want the professional contacts and networking but I could be more selective about where and when I do that. With our changing times, this feels like an important change in order to assist other professionals in a similar situation to increase their skills, meet licensure requirements and continue to offer services to under-serviced areas.

#6.[I have been] frustrated by the difficulty of getting relevant and interesting classes at convenient times and without having to travel great distances.

#7. It would allow for increased input and diversity in programming and would allow more organizations to offer CEU courses.

#8. It is often quite a challenge for me to attend a workshop since most are held in the major metropolitan areas that involve a drive about 3 hours (or more) for me. This makes attending a one-day workshop in LA, for example, to be either a 14 hour day starting quite early or it makes it a requirement that I spend a night at a hotel before the conference. I typically attend the CPA convention and get many of my CE units this way, but this is not always convenient with my schedule. I have when possible used the provision of CE units online or by book to supplement my CE experience. An additional reason I support the change is because it has been my experience that I benefit equally from my distance learning experiences as from the face to face conferences. I have appreciated being able to get credit for CE units from the reading of relevant books in my field, something that I am inclined to do anyway and feel contributes significantly to my ongoing development as a psychologist. Additionally, as the internet gets more powerful, I would expect providers to create increasing opportunities for real-time distance learning that would involve the opportunity to submit questions to presenters and other features that would enrich the online education experience.

#9.My main reasons ... are that to travel to a site to take a course is unnecessarily time consuming, expensive, and environmentally insensitive. Many of us have obligations that make it hard to travel, such as children or elderly parents to care for. I feel that although there is always the risk that a test of knowledge gained in an online CE course may be actually completed by another person, the risk of that is small, and perhaps about equal to the risk that a person sitting in a seminar room is not paying attention, and is taking the post-test by conferring with a friend. Ultimately, in both situations, we are on the honor system anyway, and are responsible for our own learning.

#10. This would greatly enhance my ability to take subject matter that is based entirely on the content and not on the costs (tuition, travel, lodging, meals, etc.). I really am much more interested in getting materials that are relevant to my practice than taking trips that are tax deductible.

#11. The vast majority of courses I have taken over the years for license renewal have been not only a waste of time and money, but they have also taken me away from my practice and my family. In fact, I can say in all honesty that the only ones I have enjoyed or learned from have been online courses.

#12. Reasons: 1) Although I would still probably take some units as face-to-face classes for networking and out of personal interest, the flexibility would be of great help to me. I am a mother of young children, as well as a psychologist, and find it hard to juggle the all-day classes into our family life. 2) I feel that I learn as well by listening to audiotapes or reading as in a face-to-face course. 3) I appreciate the variety of courses available on-line and as distance-learning courses, especially as it is often hard to find courses focused on child and adolescent issues (my primary area of practice), even in the Bay Area.

#13. I'm increasingly a big proponent of on line courses when new learning, but not fully acquired competence, is the goal. Courses can be taken at the learner's convenience, broken up into time-friendly chunks, slowed down and reviewed when learning is tough, and sped up when the material is already well learned. Including learning checks at various points throughout an on line course actually gives some impetus to paying attention. Frankly, more impetus than is typically included in live lectures! And, the financial cost for "attendance" can be very significantly reduced. Lastly, there is the issue of learning style. Some people are better visual learners, some are better auditory learners. I am one of those folks who learns more from reading than from listening to a presentation, unless the presenter is a genuinely outstanding public speaker. I'll remember a journal article (paper or web-based) much more than a typical live presentation of the same research. If you want me to learn something and think about it, and you cannot guarantee a great live presenter, giving me the option of on line learning is much more likely to achieve your purpose.

B. Those who are also CE providers

#14. My opinion is that how a psychologist obtains CE credits should be left up to him or her. Personally, I would never advise someone only to learn through home study, but I also don't think it should be regulated.

#15. To meet the requirements of the BOP, simply sitting in a physical location does not insure that anything is learned or gained. I have been to plenty of redundant, uninspired CE presentations where you can observe that people aren't paying attention and in essence, gaining nothing or little from the course. By allowing professionals to fit their learning (CE) into their work schedules, opens the potential to us taking courses that are more apropos, meaningful and that completion of an on-line, written or other format demonstration of familiarity with the material insures compliance. ...By opening the 36 hours to home study and on-line, distant learning, it is much easier to find a wider range of "relevant and interesting" material to study. ... It is more likely that a professional will chose a meaningful CE course that can be fit into a work and life schedule, than simply mandating having role taken in a live setting.

#16. [The change] would allow us to find meaningful experiences and not just attend workshops and conference as putting in time.

C. Those who did not indicate whether they were also CE providers

#17. I learn more with home study- so much of the day at a workshop is taken up with driving, parking, administrative duties, and, most important, many stretch out 2 hours of really useful material into a 6-hour workshop. Also, for those of us with health problems, an 6 CEU workshop can mean a 10 hour day, door-to-door. Sitting in an uncomfortable chair, even with breaks, can be tiring and painful. Yes, I would miss seeing colleagues, but I can do that at local psych association meetings and go to an occasional workshop if the person leading it is particularly interesting. I'd like to have more choices.

#18. I am currently limited to local workshops that meet my schedule. My experience with distance learning is that I have access to wonderful, world-class presenters with extensive downloadable materials. The courses are clearly a cut above, and accessible in my office at any

time. Please don't look at this as a convenience issue but as an opportunity to experience the leaders in our profession offering cutting edge information.

#19. It is infinitely more convenient to schedule time at home/office to study materials than to schlep to a hotel. We would be able to avoid the ancillary costs of travel, eating out, lost time, etc. It is much more time efficient (travel time, break time). I would rather spend that time working through another course - even if the CE requirement were raised from the current 36 per 2 years. With the materials completely in written/taped format, presumably, the issues of quality control and reliability/consistency of information are more easily managed. We would not have to suffer through a series of inane or overly personalized questions which some presenters seem loathe to curtail. Presumably, one would have a wider choice of information through a wider choice of "presenters"/authors/speakers, as likely there are more people who would be willing to write/tape than are willing to present in person. The course information would be in a written/taped format which could be used later as reference material - unlike the current presentations in which we must rely on our own handwritten notes (very few venues have enough plugs for laptops), and a few handouts.

#20. Currently there are excellent options available via self-study and distant learning. This also puts options within more acceptable financial range. Many of the on line options are much more competitive than workshops and do not require us missing a day of work. All of our colleagues in other fields have found a way to make this work, we can too.

#21. It is inherently more humane and consistent with the best professional and humanistic values of our profession and reflective by our ethical standards while simultaneously preserving competency, to allow us to do our CEU's this way. Located in Monterey, and being a single caregiver and cancer survivor myself, I personally have to pay for house, pet, babysitters; gas; lodgings, seminar fees; and have to travel a minimal distance of 60+ miles, which places an undue hardship while making good faith efforts to comply with state licensing requirements.

#22. The cost of on site c.e. is much too expensive compared to online courses. one must consider: tuition, the travel expense in terms of time and money, and the cost of lunch. As fees are slashed by managed care, many psychologists may find these costs a hardship.

II. Comments *against* a full 36 hours of Independent Study

A. *Consumers of CE who are not also providers:*

#23. I am in favor of being flexible and allowing more than 18 hours of ongoing training to be done at a distance -- perhaps 24. I don't think all 36 units should be allowed as distance training because I think there is value in networking and interpersonal exchanges, particularly with "cutting edge" presenters.

#24. I live and practice in a rural, mountain community, and have to travel at least 100 miles to virtually every live CE course. For people like me it would be far easier, cheaper, and allow more flexibility to be able to satisfy all 36 hours via distance learning or self-study. The drawback is that live presentations generally offer more -- e.g. greater variety of topics, multisensory input, networking, Q and A periods, professional contact, less boring. Of course, one need not choose distance learning just because it is allowed. However, my concern is that the quality, frequency, and variety of live course offerings, and their attendance levels, would be significantly decreased if the new requirement went into effect. This could negatively impact the profession. My preference would be to keep the requirement as it is, at 18 hours of distance learning allowed.

#25. I think too much would be lost in a program of exclusive self study, as great value is in the direct exchange of ideas with the presenter and conference attendees. On a personal note, I also

enjoy running into old colleagues, and or going with a friend. Self study by contrast seems rather sterile.

#26. I feel that in person CE courses are an important part of professional development. Let me explain in 2 parts.

1. Quality - I recently complete a 2 unit CE "distance" course by an APA provider. I certainly learned from the process of reading the materials, however the post test did not prove that I had read or even skimmed the material. It was primary T/F format, of which most answers I could get from the cover of the book and table of contents. And to top it off, if I scored to low they would send back the test with the incorrect items marked so you could resubmit with correct responses (must be tough with a T/F exam!) Although the materials I reviewed were quality, the ways of measuring competency gained was not. As a former monitor of CE classes at CPA conventions while a student in the 90's, I found psychologist to be of two camps. The majority care and are interested in being professional and learning. Yet those select few will do anything they can to avoid CE and cheat through CE. Distance learning 100% only encourage this. Plus what controls would their be on a Professional resubmitting the same tests every two years. As least on ground classes change with the times.

2. Discussion - Face to Face learning promotes thought and DISCUSSION. The field of psychology is a practice and a science. Some material can be learned through a book, but others require discussion. Questions are essential to the learning process in some content areas. Distance learning leaves this format out.

B. Those who are also CE Providers

#27. Limit the amount of self-study through reading material, such as traditional home study to 12 hours. More interactive classes probably meet the intent of the CE requirement. Online classes in which the material and the assessment device is delivered online could count for up to 2/3s of the hours, or 24 hours. I would require the materials to be online, not just the assessment tool. I think a requirement to have some in-person class time, such as 12 hours each renewal cycle would be beneficial as well.

#28. I personally have not gotten half as much from the courses I have taken like that as from those taken in person. I realize there are different learning styles and that colleagues in rural areas may be quite inconvenienced to attend meetings in person, but I still think that to allow more than half of the 36 units to be accrued via distance or self-study would dilute the effect.. In fairness to those colleagues who for various reasons might find attending meetings in person a hardship, I think an appeal process would be in order. If someone can make a case based on personal circumstances for accruing more units via self-study, their situation should be considered. Decisions should be made on a case by case basis.

#29. [We] have been on the workshop circuit providing workshops on supervision Our workshops have a fairly substantial interactive piece and we involve the participants in an experiential way that is essential to the learning of the model that we are trying to teach, one in which supervisory teams are constructed to facilitate the supervision of supervision process. This type of workshop and learning would not be possible if all of the supervisory hours were to be collected via distance learning. This is not to say that some distance learning on this topic would not be beneficial, but some key aspects would definitely be lost.

#30. As an instructor, I can clearly see that many individuals are taking the courses only because they have to be there, and have little interest in the program. Many participants come with reading materials and other activities. It is my hope that I can interest them in the material, and make the program useful. In most of my courses, that is a common feedback that I receive. If all CE courses were distance based, I believe many of these psychologists would find a way to accumulate hours without really learning anything. It is unclear to me how a course becomes

certified for distance learning, so perhaps this can be addressed in the approval process. I recognize that many providers prefer different learning modalities. Ironically, I do not care for a lecture modality, and prefer self study. Nevertheless, I think the current regulatory model of 18 hours of distance learning may be a reasonable balance.

C. Those who did not indicate whether they were also CE providers

#31. Face-to-face seminars are often informative, stimulating, and more likely to present material in depth. Self-study has the temptation, and the clear possibility, of "shortcuts", by which someone can skim material, or manage to pass a post-test with little genuine involvement in the course material. If nothing else, one's physical presence at a workshop encourages some greater participation in the learning process, especially if the presenter is dynamic, engaging, and well-prepared with interesting material.

#32. Continuing education is as critical and valuable to our work as our graduate education--and who really wants to see a psychologist that's received their all of their education on line? I also think that in our profession we integrate our formal education with an increasingly complex understanding of interpersonal dynamics to help our patients. It is therefore critical to have the opportunity for live exchange of information and ideas with colleagues in order to receive feedback and maintain a balanced perspective on our work.

#33. I find that attending seminars is a way to enhance my contacts within the community of psychologists. In other words, it's a community builder, and because psychologists in private practice tend to isolate a great deal anyway, to implement this new revision would only tend to increase the isolation problem. I've made many good contacts through the CE requirement, and to lose the opportunity for these contacts would be a major loss for me professionally. I know that people would have the option to attend a seminar in person, but then many wouldn't do this, and that is where the opportunity would be lost for me. I read about new ideas in psychology all the time, but to attend a seminar gives me a feeling of excitement, an appreciation for the relevance of an issue, and the opportunity to critically evaluate new ideas in a public setting.

#34. I believe that self-study is fundamentally different from -- and not as strong as -- the learning that takes place in a room full of people (where all questions and comments can be heard by all attendees). Although I realize that attendance is not the equivalent of participation, I at least hope that all attendees are listening as topics are presented and discussed. The opportunity to further discuss topics of interest with the presenter as well as with others at the training is absent as well with self-study. I feel less strongly about distance learning which, I believe, does allow for questions from the "audience." If this is not the case, I would oppose distance learning as well for the reasons stated above.

35. Perhaps a bias of being so recently out of training - but compared to internship and post-doc, the world of everyday practice feels like it really lacks ongoing quality training and interaction with other psychologists. I checked out a couple of on-line trainings and to be honest they were so easy I was able to pass the post-test without reading any of the materials - at which point I could have basically just purchased my CE's with no real training. This seemed pretty sketchy to me. I believe there is something greater than the sum of the facts in lessons that occurs during face-to-face group trainings. Also, it encourages interactions with other therapists and the development of training programs - especially important in rural areas. It creates a culture of learning, which could be seriously hurt if folks could go completely on-line for CE's.

IV. Four Continuing Concerns

Discussions and comments from professional psychologists around the state have underscored continuing concerns about: (a) the law and ethics requirement, (b) the supervision course mandate, (c) enhancing diversity competence, and (d) convincing the legislature not to mandate CE courses.

Law and ethics requirement. As indicated below, a current Board proposal focuses on altering the updating process related to law and ethics to make it more flexible.

Amend subsection (b) of section 1397.61 of Division 13.1 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations, to read as follows:

§1397.61. Continuing Education Requirements.

(b) Any person renewing or reactivating his or her license ~~on or after January 1, 2000 shall provide written evidence of completion of a continuing education course of no less than four hours in length~~ certify under penalty of perjury that he or she has obtained training and/or experience in the subject of laws and ethics as they apply to the practice of psychology in California. ~~for each license renewal cycle. This course~~ The training and/or experience shall ~~cover~~ include recent changes/updates on the laws and regulations related to the practice of psychology; recent changes/updates in ~~ethics codes~~ the *Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct* published by the American Psychological Association; ~~and practice; current accepted standards of practice; and application of ethical principles in the independent practice of psychology;~~ and any other applications of laws and ethics as they may affect a licensee's ability to practice psychology with safety to the public. ~~It is the responsibility of each licensee to certify, under penalty of perjury, to the completion of this course to the Board of Psychology as indicated on the license renewal application.~~ Each renewing licensee shall make such certification to the Board of Psychology as it is requested on the application for license renewal.

If the licensee chooses to apply a specific course on the topic of laws and ethics to meet the foregoing requirement, such a course must meet the content requirements named above, must comply with section 1397.60(c) of this Article, and may be applied to the 36 hours of approved continuing education required in Business and Professions Code section 2915(a).

Reactions to this proposal were solicited through a request in the California Psychological Association newsletter. A total of 44 responses about this proposal were received. Of these 29 favored the proposal, 13 did not, and 2 were undecided. The responses were disaggregated to determine the views of (a) those who were Consumers of CE who were not also providers (15 voted for and 2 against), (b) those who were CE Providers (6 voted for and 2 against) and (c) those who did not indicate whether they were also CE providers (8 voted for and 9 against).

Most respondents mainly stated their vote. The following examples are from those who also offered commentary.

A sampling of comments specific to this proposal is provided in Table 4.

Table 4

**About Altering the Law and Ethics Regulation:
Comments from Professional Psychologists Around the State**

Most respondents mainly stated their vote. A few examples from those who offered commentary are offered below to give a sense of what was stated. (In selecting comments, some effort was made to avoid redundancy.)

I. Comments *supporting* Change in the Law and Ethics Regulation

A. Consumers of CE who are not also providers

#1. I read professional newsletters and updates from the BOP, which give me all of the ethics info I need. I find going to the 4-hour required class redundant in most cases, and would be in favor of signing that I have obtained this information other ways.

#2. The requirement that one go through this course for every two year renewal period is a waste of everyone's time and money: every five to seven years would be plenty. And while I'm on the subject of wasting our time and money to no good purpose, I feel similarly about all these subject-specific trainings the legislature keeps coming up with in its "wisdom" that we are required to take. There is an overall rule that one does not practice outside of his/her area of competence, and that should be sufficient, as it was originally intended. No six-hour course is going to give one expertise in working with domestic violence, for example.

#3. The ethics requirement could be substituted with a written acknowledgment by the psychologist that they have taken the responsibility to inform themselves of any changes in the ethical guidelines. Perhaps, the Board of Psychology could send email or printed information on ethical guidelines, with a quiz certifying that the psychologist was fully informed of the ethical guidelines.

#4. In most years the information is repetitive and boring because there is no new information. No matter what we do for course selection it is essentially a repeat of last year and the year before. Perhaps the Board could decide, in those years when a revision of the ethics code has taken place, that four credits is necessary, but in the other years, allow a shorter 2-credit requirements for update on whatever is still controversial, or do what you are suggesting, allow a more flexible way to meet the requirement.

#5. Things really don't change all that much from year to year that I do not feel requiring 4 hours each license cycle is reasonable or helpful. Likewise many of the courses that are offered are very inconvenient for me and I'm having trouble finding one that fits the bill. Perhaps every other or every third license cycle would ... make more sense. ... I find myself reviewing issues in law and ethics weekly to be current with issues that come up with my clients, and therefore I feel I keep reasonably current anyway.

B. Those who are also CE providers

#6. Although Law and Ethics is what most of what I teach and if approved this will probably cut into my teaching, I am for this modification. As a provider, I find updating my course challenging. I try to teach something new each year, and tailor my courses to the group and audience that hires me. However most of the courses I see advertised are the same rehashed reviews. This benefits no one except those that are taking it for the first time and the organization offering the program. I believe that most psychologists are signing up for any course that is

available just before renewal of their license. Perhaps there is some benefit to this, but I think it is limited.

#7. I have seen little improvement in 17 years of the courses that deal with Ethics and Law. As I teach this course at the doctoral level, I can say with experience that the live courses are redundant, limited and do not offer the type of material that can be taken via reading, on-line or via self study. While the Board may have the magical wish that CE providers will provide anything beyond the most basic of introduction, redundant, is just that, a magical wish.

#8. I like the idea of a more flexible requirement, but what about submitting some verification...an outline, one-page summary or something.

#9. Having done it now for the past 6 years, it is becoming an obligation from which little benefit accrues. And for those us of with diplomates(Board Certifications) , would it be possible to allow us the greater flexibility in obtaining CE credits. After all, we have put ourselves before a board of examiners and have been certified as operating beyond the basics required for licensing in our area of expertise and in the area of ethics. It would suggest that diplomates have an exemplary professional attitude if not practice.

C. Those who did not indicate whether they were also CE providers

#10. In reality, making psychologists take the same material redundantly will do little to reduce violations. All mental health professionals who are caught doing illegal and unethical behaviors know these behaviors are wrong and do them anyway. All psychologists are thusly condemned to the current round of workshops because some psychologists ignore that they know are wrong to begin with. A little variety will at least make it more relevant.

#11. It has felt almost insulting to imply that we cannot hold onto the information we learned from the first four hour course, and must be reminded every two years. I suggest that after the first four-hour course has been completed we be required to take a one-hour update focusing on any changes that have occurred, and that this update be available via distance learning. Given that we are ostensibly mature, intelligent, licensed professionals, I think this should be enough to make sure we know the guidelines we are committed to live by.

II. Comments *against* the proposed change

A. Consumers of CE who are not also providers

#12. Even the psychologist with the best of intentions may not end up actually reading those books or having adequate experiences for a thorough self-update, so I feel it is important to impose some amount of structure on that process, by requiring actual CE courses, whether on-line or live. Perhaps alternative formats could be offered for those courses, though, like reading case material, and then having an online discussion of the particulars of the situation faced by the clinician described.

B. Those who are also CE providers

#13. [With the change] comes the expectation that most licensees know where to turn for updated information, or will subscribe to professional journals which they agree to read faithfully. Unfortunately, in the eight years that I have taught Law and Ethics: Risk Management in Clinical Practice, this has not been my observation. Often, questions posed in my CEU seminars reflect significant deficits in basic knowledge of crisis management and/or legal

obligations. Debate often arises when clinicians learn what is required of them, but personally disagree. Surprise is often expressed when some learn this material. Always, the feedback that I receive from participants includes commentary that the ability to dialogue about relevant clinician and/or administrative legal and ethical considerations, was of most value. The ability to take written guidelines and actively apply them in a seminar setting often concretizes learning in a manner which is not found by the methods currently under consideration by the BOP.

#14. If the aim is to require psychologists to review current and new legal and ethical laws / guidelines, then there is a much greater risk that this will not occur across licensees if they are left to do this themselves. I would limit it to approved CE providers who can be held accountable to maintain the quality of the programs. It could be through home study, online or through in-person classes.

#15. I am, however, very concerned that at all levels of licensure, both pre and post, we afford colleagues with the opportunity to dialogue and consult (and/or continue to guide this behavior). We are, after all, a profession which strongly encourages practitioners to never feel they must manage professional issues independently or in isolation. I further believe that one of the best ways to reduce legal and ethical violations and/or recidivism, is to maintain the current policy of gathering psychologists and other mental health professionals together for this specific CEU (Law and Ethics) in order for all to learn from and with each other. The best interests of our patients, as well as our profession, are thus served.

C. Those who did not indicate whether they were also CE providers

#16. Considering that licensees basically have an honor system with respect to completing ethics units seems unwise to me. The ethics rules are so particular to the protection of psychologists, consumers, and the integrity of the profession itself, it opens the door to abuses and even minor compromises that I strongly argue against. Ethics courses may be taken through distance learning, but it is unwise in my opinion to open the door too widely to "creative" options and thus potentially water down the import of the ethics message.

#17. I would similarly feel uneasy with anyone attesting to the relevant knowledge having been obtained. Even with penalties of perjury, it is too tempting to simply sign off with little or no true educational efforts having been made.

#18. In the 'old days', before requirements, you could be practicing for years without any up-to-date information. And, since we are living in litigious CA, law and ethics issues are really important. I think it should be as it is!

#19. As for certifying under penalty of perjury that one has completed the necessary study and/or experience re: law and ethics -- yikes! Would that be more clearly defined?

#20. Since malpractice insurance offers a discount for the training, I always take it. While the information is typically not "new or updated", it is always fascinating when delivered by a good presenter like APIAT. This is the meat and potatoes of what we do and I typically take more than the required hours. I also read the disciplinary actions taken. I do not have a problem with the current format.

#21. It would be rather difficult to monitor all the different methods mentioned. Also, there is one seminar in particular that gives a 15% discount of malpractice insurance coverage renewal, how would those changes affect that?

Supervision course mandate. As part of the feedback process, several unsolicited comments were sent in regarding supervision CE requirements. The five responses, all from consumers of CE who were not also providers, are included below for the record.

#1. The Board may wish to consider additional flexibility for the supervision requirement as well, as CE in this area has been redundant in my experience.

#2. I will be going through my 3 round of the supervision CE requirement this spring. Although I found the first time around interesting and useful, I have been hard pressed the second time around to find intermediate or advanced course. The courses offered by providers are almost all BASIC. When I attended the course the second go round that "claimed" to be advanced, it had little to do with supervision and more to do with how we can "research supervision". If this requirement is to be Maintained, I have two suggestions. 1. If maintained at 6 units every 2 years, I believe more specifics need to be address into the content of the course based on the years of experience of the supervisor. The needs of experienced supervisors is much different than a recent licensee. 2. Personally, I feel this repeating requirement should be decreased to 4 units or less for repeating supervisors like the LAW and Ethics requirement which is only 4 units. This would allow me more variety of CE related to the practice I supervise in rather than 6 units over and over again about the "process" of supervision.

#3. Would appreciate the Board re-evaluating the need for clinical supervisors (who have been supervising for MANY years) having to take a supervision course EVERY licensing cycle. It feels excessive and unnecessary.

#4. When the Board directed formal supervision training a few years ago, we hired an MCEP-accredited CE provider to give a 6 hour course to our faculty. Attending the course was worthless because the instructor was awful. Maybe the worst CE course I've ever attended. Monotone voice, disjointed presentation, completely unable to apply material in general to questions we asked specific to our training program. We "checked the block" established by the Board, but spent the last 3 or 4 hours checking our watches, "needing" to take bathroom breaks, etc. But here's the intriguing thing - I gave the package of materials and handouts from the course to a couple of faculty members who couldn't attend the actual presentation, without having a chance to tell them how bad the course had been. Both read the stuff, and said things to the effect of "what a great course it must have been". After the rest of us were done laughing, we actually re-read and then used the materials to generate some ideas and discussion about supervision. Since then, we've developed our own "CE" process related to supervision; we do a "journal club" discussion of articles related to supervision several times a year at faculty meetings, and last year we did our own "seminar" format supervision course during our faculty retreat. Each faculty member did a presentation on their styles, goals, etc. regarding supervision on our different, and highly varying, internship rotations. We are thinking and talking about supervision a lot more, and learning a lot more from each other, and that has absolutely NOTHING to do with having a live presentation of the original course material, all of which could have been presented on line as opposed to in Xeroxed handouts. In fact, we're doing it DESPITE the live presentation.

#5. The current requirement for Supervisors to have a Supervision course every license-renewal period is redundant and excessive - could that be adjusted to once every 6 years or so as long as the psychologist is continuing to be a supervisor?

Enhancing diversity competence. Several respondents took the opportunity to focus again on the matter of mandating CE related to diversity competence. Not surprisingly, there was a full gamut of views as reflected in the following comments:

“I believe that without regular mandates of diversity and multicultural courses at least every four years, practitioners will not be able to stay abreast of all the changes that are, and promise to continue, taking place in our pluralistic society.”

“For psychologists already licensed, a one-time CEU course of 6 hours would be sufficient. I dread the possibility of yet another mandated every-license renewal period course when there are SO many other relevant, important clinical issues that also could be required.”

“I have always found it to be insulting on a professional level that the BOP has been archaic, punitive and arrogant in not staying current with other allied professions in how CE requirements are considered (e.g. BMQAT, BBSE, Dentistry boards, etc.). The BOP has consistently treated psychologists as untrustworthy and infantile in the requirements.... It is time for the BOP to get out of the self appointed righteous parental role and accept that Psychologists are responsible, motivated and invested in continuation of their professional growth, regardless of Board mandates or expectations.”

Note: Several formal proposals were offered on this matter as well as on the topic of CE requirements in general. These are included in Appendix C.

Convincing the legislature not to mandate CE courses. Finally, it can be reiterated that there is considerable sentiment that the legislature should avoid mandating specific CE requirements.

As one respondent stressed:

Most of us out here in private practice are doing all we can just to keep our heads above water. We have almost daily battles with managed care and we have to see more patients for less money. We don't need more hurdles to be placed in front of us.

The Board is encouraged to take steps to provide information to legislators whenever the opportunity arises.

A Few Other General Comments from Respondents

“Changes would result in more psychologists just "getting by" with their training.”

“I would like to see the BOP being more flexible about what would count as continuing education. As it does with the supervision requirement, how about letting us determine what learning experiences would benefit us most. For example, I am in a bimonthly consultation group of senior analysts led by an analyst senior to all of us. We discuss cases, professional issues (legal, ethical), supervise/consult with each other. I also have two consultants to my work. Not because I don't know what I'm doing OR don't have confidence in my work. I arrange these relationships on an on-going basis to keep my skills sharp and to facilitate my capacity to formulate more clearly the chief clinical issues occurring, before they become a problem for me or my patients. Why can't something like that be included for partial credit?”

“It would be valuable if consulting with another psychologist on cases could be counted as self-study.”

“Sometimes just sitting in a chair for 8 hours is a much greater challenge to me than the actual material that is covered in the class. [And] It seems silly that we all dress up for each other, when there are no clients around, making us less comfortable than we would otherwise be.”

“I think it would be wonderful if we could collect CE units cumulative from one cycle to another. Sometimes there are courses I would like to take and don't need the units so I don't take the course until later and taking the course would serve me and my clients if I took it sooner and could apply the units to the next licensing cycle.”

“My observation has been that colleagues report that they often skirt the guidelines for such programs and attempt to respond to CEU post-test items by scanning articles for the right answer; essential learning is lost in the service of quick and conveniently earned CEU credits.”

“It is peculiar for psychologists to have more restrictive conditions for obtaining CE credit than psychiatrists and MFTs. It gives the message that we need more monitoring and therefore must be less adequate. Much the same as the four sign- ins for CE credit used to do and even the current two signs continue to do. Psychologists stand out from the crowd in a negative manner. I believe we are just as trustworthy as the other health providers.”

Appendices

- A. “Competencies in Professional Psychology” – an article by Nadine Kaslow in the *American Psychologist*, November, 2004. [\(Appendix A\)](#)
- B. Some Research and Related Literature Relevant to Discussion of Delivery Formats [\(Appendix B\)](#)
- C. Some Proposals Submitted by Respondents [\(Appendix C\)](#)

Appendix A

Competencies in Professional Psychology

Article by Nadine Kaslow in the *American Psychologist*

November 2004